

On March 7, 2023, the parties filed the instant Motion, in which the parties explain that “[t]here is an administrative record of the proceedings regarding which Petitioner now seeks judicial review,” that the parties agree the “usual Rule 26 requirements do not appear to be necessary in this case,” and that Respondent plans to file a motion for summary judgment on the administrative record, to which Petitioner will respond, and Respondent will reply. Doc. 8 at 1-2.

Having reviewed the docket in this matter, and in light of the nature of the Petition for Judicial Review and the parties’ Motion, the undersigned will grant the parties’ request. See e.g. Gossard v. Fronczak, 206 F.Supp.3d 1053, 1059 (D.Md. 2016) (discussing materials considered when a petitioner seeks judicial review pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 923(f)(3) (citing American Arms Int’l v. Herbert, 563 F.3d 78, 86 (4th Cir. 2009))).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. The Joint Motion to Stay Rule 26 Deadlines and Set Briefing Schedule is **GRANTED**.
2. The parties are **EXCUSED** from conducting an initial attorneys’ conference pursuant to Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and submitting a Certificate of Initial Attorneys’ Conference.

3. The following briefing schedule is established:

- a. On or before May 12, 2023, Respondent shall file its motion for Summary Judgment, Memorandum in Support, and a copy of the Administrative Record.
- b. On or before June 2, 2023, Petitioner shall file its opposition to the Motion for Summary Judgment.
- c. On or before June 16, 2023, Respondent shall file its reply, if any, in support of the Motion for Summary Judgment.

Signed: March 20, 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "W. Carleton Metcalf", written over a horizontal line.

W. Carleton Metcalf
United States Magistrate Judge

